THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII. SEPTEMBER, 1928. No. 9.

Full Forgiveness.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part V.

The REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

All statements of the Scriptures concerning redemption, imputation, faith, and the means of grace rest on God's full forgiveness as their foundation stone. If God forgives half, then all the texts which speak of the all-sufficient redemption through the blood of Christ become uncertain. If God forgives half, then He does not impute the righteousness of Christ unto us in the same manner as He imputes our sins unto Him. If God forgives half, then faith loses its life-line, and the Word of God its contents. For if anything is clearly testified to in God's Word, it is God's full forgiveness. 1 John 1, 7: "The blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, cleanseth us from *all* sin." [*Note.* Nobody will claim that this full forgiveness remains in force if one wallows in filth.] Not of some, no, of all. And Col. 2, 13: "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him [Christ], having forgiven you all trespasses." [*Note.* Evidently Baptism is here spoken of, as in this whole passage from V. 11 on. Also the word *συνεζωοποίησεν*, which is separated from *χαρισάμενος* by only three words, shows this.] Yes, Rom. 8, 1 the Apostle says: "There is therefore no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." [*Note.* Of course, this does not exclude that one may fall from grace, that one may be cut out of the olive tree, if one does not, by watching and praying, continue in His goodness . . . it follows indisputably from this text that as long as a man abides in Christ Jesus through faith (Gal. 3, 26) — so long, not longer, but surely so long — the word applies to him: "No condemnation to thee."] In Paul's epistles condemnation and justification are antitheses which exclude one another like darkness and light. Rom. 5, 18. Where there is no light at all, there is complete darkness; and where there is no darkness at all, there is complete light. So, then, where there is

no condemnation at all, there is full justification. Is that clear enough? And toward the end of the chapter Paul exclaims: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." This question is meant seriously: Who shall dare to quarter the forgiveness or take away but a hair's breadth of it when God justifies? And if any one would dare to do it, would that change God's judgment? It has been asserted that the forgiveness of sins in the Old Testament was incomplete, as could be seen from the fact that the Old Testament describes the forgiveness as a chief advantage of the New Testament. We do not wish to argue about the forgiveness of sins in the Old Testament at this time, but we do demand this, that he who subtracts from it because of the glorious promises which apply to the New Testament must at least not diminish these very same promises in respect to the New Testament. When, therefore, God promises through Ezekiel: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from *all* your filthiness . . . will I cleanse you . . . I will also save you from *all* your uncleanness . . . I shall have cleansed you from *all* your iniquities," Ezek. 36, 25. 29. 33, and through Micha: "He will have compassion upon us; He will subdue our iniquities; and Thou willt cast *all* their sins into the depth of the sea," Micah 7, 19 — is all of this not to be true of the New Testament also? First you argue that forgiveness under the Old Covenant is fractional because full forgiveness was promised for the New Covenant only, and then you rob the New Covenant also of full forgiveness!

God be praised, the case is different. Even the term "to justify" proves this. "To justify" means "to absolve"; and as little as a defendant in a human court of justice remains half in prison while the other half is set free, just so little does God justify half and condemn half. I wonder how great the difference in the justification of individual persons would be if it were governed by the measure of their faith. And yet, Paul declares right there where he speaks most extensively of justification before God, that it is given *without difference* unto all them that believe. Rom. 3, 22. [*Note.* "*Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολή* undoubtedly refers to that which immediately precedes." Philippi.] Yes, he bases the altogether equal gift of justification on the fact that all men are, before God, in altogether equal condemnation, Rom. 3, 23, and that they all receive the righteousness of Christ altogether freely

δωρεάν). Rom. 3, 24. [*Note. Πάντες* is the subject.] Indeed all are in altogether equal condemnation. For the Holy Spirit says: "Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all," Jas. 2, 10. [*Note. Πάντων ἔνοχος.* Of course, guilty of all commandments.] Therefore, to whom one sin is retained, all are retained. This word dispels all fractional forgiveness like a storm. In case you still have one unforgiven sin, you are guilty of the whole Law. But if all sins are retained where one is retained, then it follows that all are forgiven to him to whom one is forgiven. The righteousness of Christ is just as indivisible as the Law of God; it is either entire or not at all. This truth is also testified to by the parable in which Christ has described the procedure of forgiveness. A king takes account of a servant and finds that he owes him fifteen million dollars. Matt. 18, 24. The servant pleads for mercy, and the king, purely out of grace, forgives him, not one-half, not two-thirds, no, all the debt (*τὸ δάνειον*), immense as it was. Matt. 18, 27. Then the servant falls into grievous sin, and the outcome is that *all* the debt (*πᾶν τὸ ὀφειλόμενον*) is again demanded of him. Matt. 18, 34. So, then, he was at first entirely free, then entirely condemned. The argument that the fifteen million dollars or ten thousand talents designate only those sins which the servant remembered will not stand, for the original text expressly says that the servant was "a debtor of ten thousand talents." Matt. 18, 24. That was the exact amount of his debt. Not *he* had declared this to be the amount of his debt, but the lord had found that to be the amount in his reckoning — not a penny less, not a penny more. How is it possible, in the face of this parable, to speak of fractional forgiveness? Verily, if partial forgiveness were heard of in the kingdom of our God, here would have been the place for it. For, after all, what great crime had the poor servant committed? Naked as he was, he, perhaps, was sorely in need of the twelve dollars which he demanded of his fellow-servant. Could his lord then not say: "Half of my gift shall be taken from thee as punishment, the other half you may keep, for the present"? God does not act that way, for a manifest token that before His tribunal the sentence is either "damned" or "free." And the entire Holy Scripture, from Genesis to the Revelation of John, confirms this. Everything in it revolves around these great antitheses: friend of God or enemy of God; believer or unbeliever; child of light or child of darkness; God's own or the devil's own. And God's conduct conforms to this separation which, as a mighty chasm, extends through humanity —

blessed or damned; death or life; judgment or salvation. "He that believeth hath everlasting life, shall not come into condemnation, *is* passed from death unto life." John 5, 24; 6, 40. 47. "He that believeth not *is* condemned already," John 3, 18. 36. And the same rift extends into the next world — above the city with streets of gold, Rev. 21, 21; below the lake of fire, Rev. 20, 15. Blessed are they that have washed their robes "that they may have right to the tree of life and may enter in through the gates into the city," Rev. 22, 14. "Without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie," Rev. 22, 15. Whoever introduces a third factor between justification and condemnation in this life must also invent one for the next. [*Note.* Purgatory. See Conc. Trid., Sessio XXV, Decret. De Purgatorio. Also Sessio VI, Canon XXX: *"Si quis post acceptam justificationis gratiam cuilibet peccatori poenitenti ita culpam remitti, et reatum aeternae poenae deleri dixerit, ut nullus remaneat reatus poenae temporalis exsolvendae, vel in hoc saeculo, vel in futuro in purgatorio, antequam ad regna caelorum aditus patere possit: anathema sit."*] It is well and good to say that in the hour of death the grace of Christ intervenes in a helping way and that he who hitherto was but imperfectly justified now covers himself wholly with the righteousness of Christ and in this adornment confidently goes to meet his Judge; but a true Christian does not postpone this till the hour of his death, but wholly covers himself every moment of his life with the garment of Christ's righteousness. Besides, God finds no condemnation, not only in them that *die* in Christ Jesus, but also in them that *are* in Christ Jesus. And as long as no manuscript of Rom. 8, 1 is discovered which has "die" for "are" we shall oppose those who limit full justification to the hour of death. The blood of Christ is always our garment and always covers us completely. For the sake of this garment the Bible calls us saints. And as long as we believe, the faith of all of us is "like precious" (*ἰσότιμον*). 2 Pet. 1, 1. [*Note. Petrus omnes fideles fidem ἰσότιμον, aeque pretiosam, habere pronunciat, nimirum ratione generis et objecti. Infirma enim fides itidem apprehendit Christum ut fortis.* John Gerhard.]

The untenableness of the opinion of gradual forgiveness becomes still more apparent when it is applied to little children. If the measure of forgiveness depends on the measure of repentance, then either nothing or at least very little of the kingdom of God, of that kingdom of God which "is not meat and drink, but

righteousness and peace and joy," Rom. 14, 7, belongs to the little children. But Christ declares expressly that it belongs to the little children, yes, to them before others. Mark. 10, 14. 15. In fact, there is no greater contrast than that between gradual forgiveness and Christ's order of salvation. The doctrine of gradual forgiveness says: There is only so much forgiveness, or at least only so much enjoyment of forgiveness, as there is penitential struggle. Full possession, or at least full enjoyment of forgiveness, is not for young girls of fourteen years, not to speak of younger ones, but only for persons of mature age, after restlessly pressing forward. Christ, on the other hand, says: "Full forgiveness for infants [*ganz kleine Kinder*] only; for persons of mature age, not at all, unless they be converted and become as little children." Matt. 18, 3; Mark. 10, 13. But, since the decision concerning salvation and damnation rests with Christ and not with some learned man, it will be well to abide by the order of Christ.

Also the Confessions of our Evangelical [Lutheran] Church teach the clear and explicit opposite of gradual forgiveness. The Apology says: "Justification is . . . the approval . . . of the *entire* person." *Justificatio non est certi operis approbatio, sed totius personae.* (*Trigl.,* 181.) And the Small Catechism: "In which Christian Church He forgives daily and richly *all* sins to me and all believers. (*Trigl.,* 545.) Mark well the words "daily and richly"! I should think that that is full forgiveness. And the Large Catechism says that "we have received forgiveness and a good conscience and *are entirely acquitted,* yet is our life of such a nature that one stands to-day and to-morrow falls." (*Trigl.,* 725.) The Smalcald Articles teach with the same clearness: "That by faith . . . we acquire a new and clean heart, and God will and does account us *entirely righteous* and holy for the sake of Christ. . . . And although sin in the flesh has not yet been altogether removed or become dead, yet He will not punish or remember it. And such faith . . . is followed by good works. And what there still is sinful or imperfect also in them shall not be accounted as sin or defect, for Christ's sake, but the *entire* man, both as to his person and his works, is to be called and to be righteous and holy from pure grace and mercy, shed upon us and spread over us in Christ." (*Trigl.,* 499.) And the Formula of Concord says: "Christ covers *all* our [their] sins . . . with his complete obedience. (*Trigl.,* 923.) Is it possible to declare oneself more clearly against gradual justification and for the old order of salvation of Jesus Christ? And this doctrine is taught by all [our theologians]. The *Book of Con-*

fessions of Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg asks, XI, 5: "How does God forgive sins?" and answers: "Fully and perfectly." And Luther says: "Now we well know what forgiveness of sin means. If He forgives, He forgives *everything altogether and leaves nothing unforgiven.* Now, if I am rid of, and free from, sin, then I am also rid of death, devil, and hell and am a son of God and a lord of heaven and earth." (St. Louis Ed., XX, 751.) In another place he says: "For this reason it is called forgiveness of sin, because we are, before God, real sinners, and nothing but sin is to be found in us, although we may have *all* human righteousness. For where He speaks of sins, there must be real and great sins, just as also the forgiveness is no jest, but a real and serious matter. Therefore, if you look at this article, you have both facts: sin takes away *all* your holiness, no matter how pious you may be on earth, and, *vice versa, forgiveness removes all sin and wrath,* so that your sin cannot hurl you into hell, and your piety cannot lift you into heaven." (St. Louis Ed., XI, 1721.) Luther teaches the same doctrine wherever he touches on this subject. (St. Louis Ed., XIX, 995; II, 1457; XI, 1703 ff. 1933.) *(To be continued.)*

The Historical Significance of the Formula of Concord.

Prof. R. W. Heintze, St. Louis, Mo.

(*Concluded.*)

Melanchthon was very much concerned about having the ethical seriousness of the Reformation duly stressed, "so that the pastors would teach the fear of God, faith, love, as eagerly as they thundered against the Pope." When Conrad Cordatus, in 1536, heard one of Cruciger's lectures in which the professor used the phrase, *"Contritio est causa sine qua non justificationis,"* and protested against it, he found that Melanchthon agreed with Cruciger. In fact, Melanchthon admitted that he himself, when asked about justification, had stated that the new obedience is necessary for eternal life (*ad salutem*). Luther at that time was dean of the university and as such had to take up the complaint of Cordatus, as he had been obliged to hear the earlier protest of Nicholas Amsdorf against Melanchthon. Luther did not discipline the two defendants, but in a *disputatio,* June 1, 1537, he expressly rejected the phrase *opera necessaria ad salutem esse,* and Melanchthon did not make further efforts to defend the phrase. But almost his

entire concept of the relation between faith and sanctification was shared by one of his stoutest adherents, Prof. George Major, his colleague. In the turbulent days of the Augsburg and the Leipzig Interim, Major was Melanchthon's champion. The Interim had described the doctrine of justification, omitting *sola fide,* stressing the necessity of Christian virtues for attaining eternal life (*zur Seligkeit*), and emphasizing the reward of good works. Amsdorf at Magdeburg, during the Interim disputes, published *Dass Dr. Pommer und Dr. Major Aergernis und Verwirrung angericht,* 1551, rousing the fear of false prophets particularly among the Mansfeld clergy, for whom Major had been designated as superintendent. Count Albrecht of Mansfeld expelled Major without giving him an opportunity to defend himself. The Doctor had answered Amsdorf's attack in *Auf des ehrw. Herrn Niclas v. Amsdorf's Schrift G. Majors,* Wittenberg, 1552. The tenor is respectful toward his "dear father and teacher." He denied ever having doubted the *sola fide;* yet he added: "But this I admit, that I did teach, and do teach, and intend to teach all my life, that good works are necessary for eternal life (*zur Seligkeit*), and I say publicly, in clear and plain words, that nobody attains eternal life (*selig werde*) through evil works and that nobody attains eternal life without good works; more: whoever teaches otherwise, even though it be an angel from heaven, let him be anathema." [1] Though he explained, ten pages later, that he did not mean to ascribe any merit to works, Flacius and Gallus assailed him most severely, and Amsdorf joined their forces with his *Kurtzer Unterricht auf Dr. Georg Majors Antwort, das er nit unschueldig sey, wie er sich tragice rhuemet,* Basel (!), 1552; from Hamburg and Luebeck protesting voices were heard, and throughout the next eighteen years ever new pens were set agoing against Major's contentions. Major preached on them and turned most vehemently upon Flacius [2] with acrid criticism. At the same time the question as to the place of the divine Law in the Christian religion and the question as to the quality of the human will and as to differences in sins, the essence of original sin, the essence and the value of a good conscience, were being discussed, mixed up, misunderstood, sidetracked, cleared up. A synod of Eisenach and a colloquy at Altenburg [3] (1568—69) were kept busy with Major's

1) Folio C, 1. See also Schluesselburg, *Cat. Haer.,* Part 7, p. 30.

2) *Sermon von der Bekehrung Pauli.*

3) Eisenach: in Flacius's *De Voce et Re Fidei,* 1563, p. 199; in Altenburg: *Ganze und unverfaelschte acta und Handlungen des Colloq.* There are two texts, which somewhat differ from each other.

and these other matters. Yet Major remained professor at Wittenberg and, in 1558, even became dean of the theological faculty, which office he kept to his death, in 1574. During the polemics there were several derailments of argument trains: Amsdorf's *Das die propositio, gute Werk sind zur Seligkeit schedlich, eine rechte, ware, Christliche propositio sey,* Witt., 1559, has reference, it is true, to works through which men wish to *merit* eternal life, and in this sense Luther had used the same terms, *noxius* and *schaedlich.*[4] But Amsdorf, in *our* connection, certainly was guilty of a dangerous slip, and it is rather surprising how mildly he was handled in this derailment by the Gnesio-Lutherans.[5] Another case is that of Flacius, who had been "driven" by Strigel, in the synergistic controversy, to the unguarded, but later on defended, statement that original sin is the *substance* of natural man.[6] Justus Menius, who had been expected to condemn Major, unexpectedly supported him.[7]

However, in order to silence the objection that *necessaria ad salutem* must ascribe merit to Christian living in sanctification, both Melanchthon and Major (the latter repeatedly) declared their willingness to drop the phrase *ad salutem.*[8] Nevertheless, there was more involved in this entire matter than the choice of an unhappy phrase owing to Major's and his companions' unskilled dialectics and their awkwardness in choosing adequate terminology. The Mansfeld clergy was somewhat mollified by Major's declaration against the meritoriousness of good works. But if good works are not to be a sort of concomitant condition of justification, then Flacius was right when he asserted that his opponents' twofold

---

4) In *Freiheit eines Christenmenschen:* Good works are *noxia* to *justitia fidei* if some one presumes to be justified through them. In a sermon of October 24, 1522: The great works of the monks "*sind uns schaedlich zur Seligkeit und dem Reiche Gottes.*"

5) Melanchthon called Amsdorf's phrase "*eine unflaetige Rede.*" C. R., 9, 407.

6) *De Peccati Originalis aut Veteris Adami Appellationibus et Essentia,* an essay appended to his *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae,* 1567.

7) *Verantwortung Justi Menii auf Matt. Flacii giftige und unwarhafftige Verleumbdung,* Witt., 1557; his *Bereitung zum seligen Sterben,* 1556; *Justi Menii kurtzer Beschaid auff den Vortrab. Fla. Ill.,* Witt., 1557; *Justi Menii Bericht der bittern Warheit,* Witt., 1558.

8) Melanchthon, in his report on the Frankfort Argument of 1558, *C. R.* 9, 498; Major, in his *Bekenntnis v. d. Artikel d. Justif.,* Witt., 1558, fol. B 1 a. The sarcastic charge that Major seems to have had a defective memory, because in the same *Bekenntnis* he says: "*Dass ich aber diese Wort, gute Werk sind den Glaeubigen zur Seligkeit noetig, mein Leben lang . . . nie nicht gebraucht habe, berufe ich mich auf alle diejenigen,*" etc., is unjust, because he here refers to the time before Amsdorf's attack in 1551.

explanation led to absurd confusion, namely, the explanation that faith, which *alone* obtains righteousness and eternal life, must be *followed* by good works, *and* that such works are necessary unto life eternal *because* faith must prove itself by good works.[9])

Major, in the same *Sermon von der Bekehrung Pauli* in which he admitted that obedient life does not earn justification, declared that, as a fruit of faith, it is necessary for the *retention* of salvation and to insure against its loss.[10]) For him forgiveness *and* sanctification are the *two* factors that make for eternal life, or justification. It naturally follows that justification in life here on earth is merely begun. He wrote: "There is a double *salvificatio* or (*seu*) *justificatio,* one in this, the other in eternal life. The one in this life consists, first, in the remission of sins and the imputation of righteousness; secondly, in the gift of the Holy Ghost, His work of renewing, and in the hope of eternal life which is to be given gratis on account of Christ. This *salvificatio* and *justificatio* is only *inchoata* and incomplete, because in the persons justified and saved (*justificati et salvati*) by faith there still remains sin." And further on: "Thus through faith and the Holy Ghost we *begin* (*coepimus*), indeed, to be *justificari, sanctificari et* [!] *salvari;* but we are not yet *justi et salvi. Reliquum igitur est, ut* PERFECTI *justi et salvi* FIAMUS." [11]) And his "associate," Menius, answers the question why we are *"gerecht und selig"* before God only through faith thus: "Because through faith we receive, in the first place, remission and the righteousness or obedience of Christ with which He has fulfilled the Law for us; secondly [or: afterwards? *danach*], because we also receive the Holy Spirit, who works and fulfils (*ausrichtet und erfuellt*) in us the righteousness demanded in the Law, in this life beginning it and perfectly in the life beyond." [12]) Even if he wanted his *danach* to be taken as expressing chronology, the one *following* the other (which is contrary to the entire concept of those men), the fact remains that he made both, the Savior's work *for* us and our sanctification, the *cause* of our justification.

Now, it may be that some of the clergy and theologians had been rather mechanical in their insistence that Christian life in

---

9) *Wider den Evangelisten des hl. Chorrocks,* fol. C (quoted by Thomasius in his *Dogmengeschichte*).

10) *Bekenntnis v. d. Artikel der Justif.,* fol. A, 4 b.

11) Quoted by Schluesselburg, Part 7, p. 348, from Major's *Dispos. Epist. ad Rom.*

12) *Verantwortung,* 1557, fol. N, 4.

good works *follows* faith, placing the sequence rather in chronology than in logic or the psychology of conversion. But though such occurrences may have prompted the Majorists to express themselves as they did, this certainly did not explain everything. The real fact of the matter is that they had fundamentally false views regarding free grace, views which destroyed the forensic character of the divine act of justification just as effectively as did those of Osiander.

Besides Biblical, exegetical, dogmatic objections, the opponents also pointed out the nefarious practical results of Majorism. Christians in great anguish of soul because of their sinfulness, sinners grasping Christ in faith in the hour of death, men and women in their trials and doubts, would find no peace; or they said, Majorists were leading Christians toward self-righteousness. There was enough healthy circumspection in the young Church to repel this destructive doctrine everywhere; Major was fought until his death, 1574. Particularly Flacius was ever active — against Philippism; that is what, after all, Major represented.

The general denunciation of the Leipzig Interim had also been directed against some statements of Melanchthon on the power of natural man's will in regard to its attitude to God's offer in the Gospel, that is, the power of his will in the act of conversion. Melanchthon's position *de libero arbitrio* had changed; *e. g.*, the 1543 edition of his *Loci* breathes quite a different spirit from that found in the Augsburg Confession. Already in the second edition of the *Loci* he attributed an active part to human will in conversion, naming three causes of conversion: the Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and human will, *non sane otiosa, sed infirmitati suae repugnans. . . . Deus nos . . . vocat, movet, adiuvat, sed nos videremus ne repugnemus.*[13] And the next edition says: . . . "a will that agrees with the Word of God, though *languide,* and does not resent it. . . . Why is Saul rejected, David accepted? There must be some different act in these two (*aliqua dissimilis actio in his duobus*).[14] . . . *Praecedit gratia, comitatur voluntas.*" The Leipzig Interim contained declarations which were at least ambiguous, allowing the interpretation in the *liberum arbitrium*

---

13) *C. R.*, 21, 376.

14) *C. R.*, 21, 658. 660; *Loci*, 1543, p. 659: "*Non possum, inquies. Imo aliquomodo potes, et cum te voce evangelii sustentas,* ADIUVARI *a Deo petito.*"

sense.[15] All Philippists shared these views, giving up, in a smaller or larger measure, the fruit of Luther's debate with Erasmus. Luther had upheld the truth that there is in man a *capacitas conversionis,* but not a *facultas se convertendi.* The anti-Interim people balked at Melanchthon's phrases, but at the time just this matter did not develop particular polemics.

However, in the year of the Augsburg religious peace, 1555, Prof. John Pfeffinger, of the University of Leipzig, one of the coauthors of the Interim, published two series of academic lectures on Melanchthon's theory of the free will, in which he merely collected Melanchthon's various views on the three causes of conversion, the universal promises, and the method of knowing about predestination (*a posteriori*), and, in conclusion, pointed to the "more detailed explanation" of the doctrine on free will in the Magister's works. Pfeffinger's own views were Melanchthonic: several factors work together (*causae agentes concurrunt*): the Spirit, who influences through the Word, a mind which thinks, and a will which does not reject, but obeys the already working (*movens*) Spirit. In this connection he mentioned *aliqua synergia voluntatis nostrae,* and according to a quotation reported by Flacius he said: "But all those who wish to be in the light of eternal God . . . must look *toward* the rising sun and not turn their eyes *from* the light. *Haec certe est synergia.*" [16] Of course, this was equivalent to a retraction of the *pure passive.* The Thuringian opponents of Philippism, in a convention at Weimar, January, 1556, energetically rejected Pfeffinger's theses. (Hauck's *Realenzykl.,* 3. ed., Vol. 19, p. 231.)[17] There followed some exchange of arguments between Melanchthon and Gnesio-Lutherans, but without reference to Pfeffinger. But in 1558 Stolz had his theses printed and circulated, and both Amsdorf, of Magdeburg, and Flacius, of Jena (where lately a university had been founded), began a vehement attack upon him.[18] Pfeffinger was rebuked for having asserted,

15) The full text of the Leipzig Interim is contained in Bieck's *Das dreifache Interim,* 1721, p. 361 ff.

16) *Refutatio Propositionum Pfeffingeri,* fol. E, 4 vols.; quoted in O. Ritschl., *Dogmengesch. des Prot.,* 1912; Vol. II, 1, p. 431, note 4; also in *Acta Colloq.,* Altenburg, fol. 498 a.

17) Thomasius-Seeberg's remark is misleading in *Dogmengesch.,* Vol. 2, 1889, p. 498: "*Dagegen* [against Pfeffinger's *disputationes*] *erbot sich nach* EINIGEN JAHREN [1558] *Amsdorf,*" which seems to make Amsdorf's the first reply. Also, John Stolz, of Weimar, in 1556, wrote 110 theses against Pfeffinger.

18) Tschackert calls the two books of Flacius "*gewissermassen als Programm der* [Jenaer] *theol. Fakultaet gegen die Witt. u. Leipz.*" *Entstehung der luth. u. ref. Kirchenlehre,* 1910, p. 522.

"ganz frech und vermessen," that man could, with the natural strength of his free will, prepare himself for the reception of divine grace and of the Holy Spirit; he was put on a level with Thomas Aquinas, Scotus, etc. "Natural man has been changed to an image of Satan," and: "How can our conversion not be a work of God alone when our satanic ill will (*malitia*) of the flesh or of the free will not only does not cooperate, but even draws back and rejects (*reluctante et repugnante*)?" (Flacius.) In his answer to Amsdorf (Flacius is barely mentioned), Pfeffinger plainly, extensively, and without hedging expressed his synergism, *viz.,* that not only the regenerate, but even the natural will of man possesses the ability to follow the divine Spirit *or* to decline to do so. Many public lectures and debates on this subject were held in Jena, Wittenberg, and Leipzig, and Melanchthon took a hand in them.

Duke John Frederick of Saxony, in 1559, commissioned Jena professors to work out a *Confutatio et Condemnatio Praecipuarum Corruptelarum,* etc., which condemned Servetus, Schwenkfeld, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Osiander, etc., etc., and in the sixth paragraph contained a refutation of the errors *in articulo de libero arbitrio sive de viribus humanis.* This book was to be read from the pulpits as the norm of doctrine strictly to be adhered to in ducal Saxony. But in Jena itself obstacles arose. Rev. Huegel refused to read this *Confutatio* to his congregation, and Prof. Victorinus Strigel objected to it on the ground that Flacius had "invented a new theology." Both were arrested, but discharged after half a year, and the duke ordered a public disputation between the Jena professor and the ex-professor (Strigel was suspended) at Weimar in August, 1560.[19] Thirteen sessions were held, in the course of which Flacius was led to that regrettable expression about original sin.[20] Strigel, who, like almost all the others, took recourse to similes, argued from the magnet, which, smeared with onion juice, does not exercise its power of attraction, yet remains a magnet, while, when goat's blood takes the place of the onion juice, the magnet again exercises its innate power. This led to Melanchthon's *"Concurrunt in conversione haec tria: Spiritus Sanctus,*

---

19) Salig, III, 587 ff., and *Disputatio de Originali Peccato et Libero Arbitrio inter Matth. Flac. Ill. et Vict. Strigel,* 1562 (published 1563), and *Acta Disp. Vin.*

20) For the narrative of this part see *Flac. Ill.,* by Preger, Vol. II, 310 ff.

movens corda; vox Dei; voluntas hominis, quae voci divinae assentitur." Natural man is not dead, but merely sick.[21]) The Illyrian had hard work to get his opponent to stick to the *status controversiae.* He said: "I want you to tell me whether you say that the will cooperates either before the gift of faith or after faith has been kindled; whether you say that cooperation in conversion flows from natural powers, or to what extent the good will is given in consequence of the renewing of the Spirit: *two questions literally and in spirit one.*" [22]) Strigel would either evade the question, or he would say: "*Homo non renatus non cooperatur; at in conversione cooperatur.*" At any rate, conversion is brought about by two factors, God's *and* man's will.[23])

The debate brought no decision, partly on account of Flacius's erroneous statement regarding original sin. Both sides were commanded to remain silent. But the clergy of Mansfeld, Hamburg, Rostock, and several other places, and such men as Brenz, J. Moerlin, and J. Andreae expressed their disagreement with Strigel, and even theologians of Wittenberg and Leipzig (the latter, however, with the modification that man is *pure passivus quoad* MERITUM JUSTIFICATIONIS *et vivificationis*). Martin Chemnitz, of Brunswick, gave a clear survey in 1561, *sine ira,* and defined the doctrine calmly.[24])

All the following years saw a very large number of publications, conferences, and colloquies, which present a veritable medley of views on all sorts of issues closely or loosely related to this psychological question: *Duplex repugnantia;* character of enmity against God; variety among natural men; is man like a stone or a log? relation between actual events and God's determination; *justitia civilis* and longing for redemption; "external" hearing of the Word; contemplating "diligently"; the effect of the means of grace; relation between Spirit and Word, between intellect and will; identity of consciousness in unconverted and converted condition; foreknowledge of God; the lost image of God; mortal and venal sin, etc., etc. Upon the whole, the opponents of the Philippists wanted to have the question of predestination excluded from this discussion. Yet they were not unanimous in stating the very point of controversy. At the Altenburg colloquy, 1568—69, this

21) *Disputatio,* pp. 24. 101.
22) *L. c.,* pp. 43. 71. 100. 233.
23) *L. c.,* p. 131.
24) *De Controversiis Quibusdam,* 1561.

was agreed upon: "As Luther says against Erasmus, we are not contending about the question what man can do spiritually before his rebirth, nor what he can do after it, but the main question is what man can accomplish *in* and *toward* his own conversion, from his natural, innate faculties." [25] But the Pomeranians considered the most important point to be "what kind of liberated will man receives in conversion through the renewing power of the Spirit, and how conversion comes about." [26] Even when preparations were being made to formulate the Lutheran doctrine on this question, there were arguments not only on the correctness of the answer, but also as to which question should be answered. Anhalt, Nuremberg, and Rostock were not satisfied with the definition of the point of controversy.[27] Nor was there harmony with respect to methods. Arguments had been adduced, on the Melanchthonian side, from Aristotle, from personal experience, and self-introspection; and when these theologians had been rebuked because of this, being told that this was not a truly theological method, the reply had calmly been given that in a question of this kind human knowledge of psychology decided matters.

Aside from many differences among individual members of the two opposing parties, the fact remains that the Melanchthonian school, trying to solve the *arcana Dei,* had entered a road which was apt to reach its goal, but in — Rome. One of the ethical fruits of the Reformation is the knowledge that man, for his own salvation, can absolutely not place his trust in his own power, but merely and solely in God's mercy and Christ's merits; nothing in us, not a God-impelled and God-supported will, is the cause of our spiritual welfare, and, as Professor Frank says [28]: "For the crushed heart it is absolutely all the same whether much or little is demanded of the *liberum arbitrium* as *facultas se applicandi ad gratiam.*" There is hardly any difference between Strigel and the Tridentinum, in the latter of which the "will is like a fettered man, who *possesses innate* strength, but is hindered by chains." [29]

Calvinists and Romanists were eagerly watching: would the apple of the shaking tree fall into Zwingli-Calvin's or into Rome's lap?

---

25) *Coll. z. Altenb.*, Jena, 1569, fol. 489 B (also Wittenberg, 1570).
26) Balthasar, *Historie des Torgauer Buches*, P. 3, p. 47.
27) O. Hutter, *Concordia Concors*, p. 510.
28) *Theol. d. Konkordienformel*, Vol. 1, 1858, p. 134.
29) Chemnitz, *Examen Conc. Trid.*, I, 214.

At the synod of Eisenach, 1556, convened for the purpose of settling the Major controversy, naturally the question about the validity of the divine Law, its function, its place in man's religious life, was touched upon. In this field, too, there were not only two camps, but there was disharmony in each. Between 1527 and 1540 Melanchthon and then Luther had been charged with false teaching on the influence of the Law in bringing about repentance. The charges had been brought by John Agricola in Eisleben, who taught that God's Law exerted no beneficial influence, but only damned and killed and consequently could not bring sinners to a knowledge of their sins, but that this is brought about when the sinner embraced the Gospel of Christ. The Antinomian was flayed by Dr. Martin, and he revoked several times until the demand of retraction became so weighty that he accepted a call to the court of Berlin, 1540, where, later on, he was coauthor of the Augsburg Interim.[30] This kind of Antinomianism seemed to have been settled. However, in connection with the discussions on justification, on sin, on good works, on free will, the question grew exciting as to the relation between Law and Gospel, *after* conversion, in the believing Christians' lives. Many "Lutheran" theologians held that believers have nothing whatever to do with the Law, not even as a guide in Christian living; Moses knew nothing of our faith and religion, *ergo;* the Law had no business in church and pulpit, but only in the courthouse; evangelical preachers must preach no Law; no man can go to heaven if the "third use" of the Law is taught.[31] Consistently, on the other hand, Agricola's transfer of the function of the Law into the Gospel was rejected as well as Melanchthon's thesis that the Gospel is a proclamation of repentance, on account of which the entire Philippist school was suspected of Antinomianism. The Altenburg colloquy, 1568—69, dealt with the trouble which had settled down to a question as to the *tertius usus legis.* True, the facts of Golgotha may give a heavy evaluation of the greatness of the sinner's guilt to a believer, but he will appreciate so much more the blessed mercy and forgiveness. God's Law not seriously meant? not crushing? The Christian's inner voice only *one,* only the Spirit's? No conscience which needs a corrective, a guide, a norm to distinguish between the two voices within? Antinomians dealt much with the terms *in abstracto* and

30) Luther's theses in E. A., Opera Varii Argumenti, Vol. 4.

31) A selection of Antinomian theses is found in J. Seehawer, *Zur Lehre vom Gebrauch des Gesetzes,* etc., 1887, p. 97 f.

in concreto. Antinomianism was on the point of creating an abstract Christianity; it would have had to make abstract Christians. Any man who follows these discussions of that time repeatedly will feel like calling out: "I want my whole concrete self to be a Christian, die a Christian, and rise to eternal life!"

The religious peace of Augsburg, 1555, gave additional importance to the Augustana: it became a protective charter for the churches which adhered to it. So, then, the question would have to arise, Which churches or which territories really represent the Augustana? And in those days the question was hard to answer. Some of the problems had been solved in 1530 only in a general way, while some had not been thought of or even mentioned. What was needed, then, was closely to define the various articles held by Lutherans and to fill the gaps by definite statements, and all that in strict harmony with the sense and spirit of the earlier documents. That was done by the Formula of Concord for all those realms whose eight thousand clergymen and officials set their names to it.

Calvin had subscribed to the Augsburg Confession as interpreted by Melanchthon. Politically speaking, that gave him the protection which no other fact under the conditions of the century could give him; for Calvin's Church as such was not recognized. Calvin could not sign the Formula, not only because he was in the grave by that time, but because the Formula told him that he had misunderstood the Augustana. Without such signature the Calvinistic churches, strictly speaking, had no legal status in the Holy Roman Empire, which status was granted a hundred years later, in the peace of Osnabrueck and Muenster, 1648. Thus, unfortunately under an imperial denial of religious liberty, but nevertheless in fact, a clean-cut differentiation was established between the truly renovated Church and the church that had come into existence through defection from the first, original principles of Protestantism. The continuity of genuine back-to-the-Bible Protestantism had been interrupted by Calvino-Philippism and was restablished by the Formula of Concord.

We are not speaking of the benefits derived from these thirty years' polemics. They exist: theses became clarified by antitheses; exegesis was intensified and made systematic; all intelligent debate is helpful. What, however, if concord had been reached, but a different one? Some writers of histories of dogma present the doctrinal divergences among the Lutherans at that time almost as distinctions without differences. It is possible that some merely

misunderstood each other. It is true that, *e. g.,* Flacius, finding that a phrase he used, resembled too closely that used by the opponents changed that phrase in the printed book, and that, *e. g.,* Amsdorf "was taken in" with the entire conference at Eisenach, in agreeing upon a certain term.[32] But there were real divergences, diverging more and more, in degree and expansion, like the sides of angles. An unchecked Osiander will soon be in medieval Rome; an unchecked synergist will be with the scholasticists; some opponents of theirs will arrive at Calvin's predestination. *Sola gratia, sola fide, sola Scriptura, soli Deo gloria,* those were the things at stake, and many a "theologian" was playing *va banque.* No wonder Chemnitz is called "the other Martin."

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

The Minister as Thinker and Student. — In an address delivered by Prof. H. Hamann at the "Concordia College [Australia] Break-up Concert" several important truths concerning a minister's intellectual training were stressed, which deserve notice also in our circles. The speaker said: —

"Many other reasons demanding a sound, thorough education of the future theological student may be adduced. Very high in the list I would place this: the development of the mind of the *student,* the attitude of the *scholar.* The minister certainly must be a thinker, a scholar, a student — a student of the Bible, of religious movements, past and present, of life and men, of the trend of the times, of things too numerous to mention. What do I mean by the mind of the student? This, that he knows how to approach problems of all sorts, with what tools, and how to solve them; this, that he has proper methods of work; this, that he feels a keen zest in his work and is not terrified by difficult tasks, but grapples with them manfully and says, The harder, the better. This attitude is not developed in a day nor in a year; it is the outcome of long, systematic, arduous study and of the discipline which that study involves. This mental attitude, together, of course, with a quickened conscience, is the protection against the easiest way, the line of least resistance, against the power of inertia, against the fatal fear of earnest intellectual work. The minister must be earnest and sincere not merely in a spiritual sense, but intellectually as well. Certainly faith is the organ for the reception of divinely revealed truth; but an intellectual effort of no mean order is necessary to sift the great mass of conflicting opinions; to judge, criticize, reject, accept. There must be no blind 'swearing by

32) When he realized it, he said: ***Maledicta ergo sint omnia colloquia cum adversariis!*** Quoted by Ritschl, *l. c.,* p. 403.

the words of the master,' no facile acceptance, uncritical and unconvinced, of traditional teaching. We must be orthodox; but we must arrive at orthodoxy by our own faith and our own reason — the latter, of course, used in its proper subordinate sphere.

"*Culture* is another reason. I shall not try to add one more definition to the many already existing definitions of culture; I shall say only that I take it to include both *Herzensbildung* and *Geistesbildung,* culture of the heart as well as of the mind. These are indispensable in a minister. There are certain things which he must know lest he be classed as an ignoramus. I need not expatiate upon the harm that is done if the minister fails here; I need only say again that it takes much time and much study before we can convert our young boys, many of whom are decidedly diamonds in the rough, into Christian gentlemen and scholars who will be a credit to the Christian ministry.

"Finally I would mention *sympathy.* Wide sympathy is a consequence of wide culture, if the culture is of the right kind. There is much truth in the old French saying: to understand all is to forgive all. Let us modify this saying thus for our present purpose: to understand all is to have sympathy for and with all. I need not remark that this sympathy does not extend to the devil and his works, sin, though it does extend to human misery as caused by human frailty and sin. Not that the cultured person has a monopoly of sympathy; but there must always be thoughts and feelings to which the uncultured remain strangers. And are not lack of sympathy, narrowness of thought and feeling, intolerance in things that lie in the sphere of Christian liberty, usually the outflow of lack of understanding, of ignorance? It is the Christian who knows only his own community, who knows nothing of what Christians have done in other times, of what they are doing in other places — it is he who looks askance at everything that is not in his sphere of things; it is he who is always being shocked, offended, outraged, in a manner not becoming a Christian. We do not care for this in our ministry. Why, sympathy, understanding, is often the master-key that unlocks the door to the sinner's heart and wins his confidence. And the minister must be all things unto all men; he must be a stranger to no human affairs."

Professor Hamann is a graduate of Concordia Seminary, who for a number of years served in our India Missions. He now occupies the chair of Latin and Greek at Concordia Seminary, Adelaide.

MUELLER.

Icelandic Passion Hymns Translated into Chinese. — To many people it is a revelation to know that one of the great poets of the Lutheran Church was Rev. Hallgrimur Petursson of the Lutheran Church of Iceland. His hymns are so outstandingly beautiful, and at the same time so thoroughly doctrinal that he has been called the Icelandic Paul Gerhardt. His hymns for the Lenten season are especially notable for beauty and power. The best hymns of this series have now been translated into Chinese by an American scholar, Prof. Harry Price, with the assistance of an Icelandic missionary,

Olafur Olafsson. The translation thus produced is said to combine accuracy and excellence of idiom. For his general guidance Prof. Price used the English translation of the *Icelandic Passion Hymns* made by Prof. Pilcher a few years ago. The undertaking has now reached the stage in which a responsible and reliable man in Hankow has undertaken to see the book through the press. The hymns are to be published in a small book, to be sold as cheaply as possible. If the undertaking is successful, a somewhat larger edition of the Icelandic hymns in Chinese is planned. All those who are interested in the publication of the book may communicate with Mr. Arni Johannsson, 31 Bragagoetu, Reykjavik, Iceland. The publisher intends to give every missionary of the Lutheran confession in China a copy free of charge. Those who are interested in becoming acquainted with Missionary Olafsson may address him at Fannrem, pr. Trondhjem, Norway. K.

The Catholic Religion Not the Christian Religion. — Present-day Catholicism has as little Christianity in it as the Catholicism of Luther's day. Luther used the terms Catholic religion and pagan religion as synonyms. And what *Our Sunday Visitor* has to say on the way of salvation might have been written, with the change of a single word, by a Buddhist or a Confucianist. The issue of March 25 carries an article on "Divine Revelation." Its author is Cardinal Mundelein. We give the entire article.

"It is indeed necessary that we dwell repeatedly on divine revelation, for revelation is the very keystone of the arch; on it rests the entire structure of our faith; without it the whole structure crumbles. We may know that there is a God from the creatures about us, but we can learn but little further of Him from that same source. And if we cannot know Him, we surely will not love Him. Nor can we serve Him unless He tells us how, what He wants us to do in order to please Him. And He alone can reveal these things; so that revelation is necessary if we look forward to happiness hereafter. Otherwise we sink to the very level of the brute creation, and all would be over after a few years here below. In like manner, if God revealed His truths and laws, these must remain unchanged, not become the playthings of men or vary with different races or changing times or different climes. There can be no question that we sorely need more preaching and teaching of a supernatural religion.

"Professing Christians are willing indeed to accept a Christ, the healer, or the multiplier of the loaves and fishes, but are not so ready to listen to Christ the lawgiver. A revealed religion is repugnant to the masses, because it entails self-denial here, a strict accounting at the end, and eternal retribution in an after life. And yet, for the general well-being of the community in which we live, not to speak of eternal salvation of the individual, we ought to dwell often on the subject of a revealed religion. A prominent lawyer recently said: 'You cannot expect to raise a boy properly unless you teach him that there is a hell, and that, unless he watches himself very carefully, he is sure to land in it.' We have had quite a few samples of juvenile viciousness in this city recently where boys and girls

had neither the instruction nor the restraint of real religion to hold them. While we are naturally concerned with the well-being of our community, yet we are even more concerned with the eternal salvation of the faithful under our care, and we know only too well that, where the moral tone of the former is lowered, we can hardly expect that the latter escape contamination. There is just the one thing to do — to apply the antidote of repeated instruction for growing children, and adults as well, in supernatural religion, which brings with it the restraint of moral obligation."

The Buddhist would only have to change "Christ the lawgiver" into "Buddha the lawgiver" to get a fine article for "Our Buddhist Visitor" on the Buddhist revelation. The specific article of the Christian revelation is salvation through the vicarious satisfaction rendered by Christ. The essential teaching of Buddhism and Confucianism is: "Nor can we serve Him unless He tells us how, what He wants us to do in order to please Him." E.

The Catholic Religion Not the Christian Religion.—Rev. Albert Muntsch, S. J., writes in *Our Sunday Visitor,* on "Three Important Lessons from the Public Life of Christ": "By the public or active life of our Divine Lord we mean the last three years of His blessed career on earth which He devoted to works of mercy, to the preaching of the doctrine, and to the foundation and perfecting of the Church. — That life was, in the first place, a life of work. This is the first lesson it holds out to us. We must all work and be active in some way. — That life was, in the second place, a life of prayer. — The active life was, in the third place, a life of suffering. For Christ sought not the comforts of life. His friends had none, or few, of the good things of the world and so could not enrich Him. He said of Himself that He had not where to lay His head. Worse than this, He suffered from the opposition, calumnies, and persecutions of His enemies. For did they not seek to put Him to death? Again, the people who listened to Him to-day, were ready to stone Him on the morrow. Now who cannot learn much wisdom and draw help and inspiration from our Lord's conduct during His public career? Is not our's a life of labor? Can we succeed without prayer? Is not suffering and trial and hardship our portion? We may then look upon that model whom we all must imitate — Christ Jesus in His public life. If we do so, we may be certain to follow the path that leads to final victory and to perseverance in God's commandments. For Christ is still the Way, the Truth, and the Life: the way that we should walk, the truth we should know, and the life we should imitate; He is the King of kings." The religions which this young Jesuit — we presume that he was but lately graduated from the seminary — is advocating is the religion of works. The conception which he has of Christ is that of a great lawgiver and fine example. He did not learn in his seminary that men are saved by faith in the vicarious atonement. If he had stated that sinners are saved, not by imitating Christ, but by accepting the salvation wrought by Him, *Our Sunday Visitor* would not have found space in its columns for his contribution. E.

Godliness in Business. — *America* calls attention to the need of religion in daily life and business and for this reason reminds its readers of the habits of Boston business men about two centuries ago. We read: "At the dawn of the eighteenth century, in the godly town of Boston, men mixed a little religion with their business and found that the result was good. A new England shipping bill of 1718, reproduced in the fourth volume of *The Pageant of America,* reads more like a prayer than a business paper. 'Shipped by the Grace of God,' are the opening words of this document; 'in Good Order and Well-conditioned by John Barton, in and upon the Good Brigantine, called the *Betty,* whereof is Master, under God, for this present Voyage, Captain John Sewell, and now Riding at Anchor in the harbour of Boston, and by God's Grace Bound for Great Britain.' A description of the goods entrusted to the deep and to Captain John Sewell follows, and this — to us — singular document concludes: 'And so God send the Good Brigantine to her desired port in safety! Amen.'"

Luther, long ago, called attention to the practise of religion in one's daily life when in his Large Catechism he wrote: "Likewise the practise of children to cross themselves when anything monstrous or terrible is seen or heard, and to exclaim, 'Lord Jesus, protect us!' 'Help, dear Lord Jesus!' ["is of service"]. Thus, too, if any one meets with unexpected good fortune, however trivial, that he say, 'God be praised and thanked; this God has bestowed on me,' etc., as formerly the children were accustomed to fast and to pray to St. Nicholas and other saints."

Luther, at the same time, emphasizes the fact that the Roman Catholic Church is unable to put true godliness into business; for he continues: "This would be more pleasing and acceptable to God than all monasticism and Carthusian sanctity." (*Triglotta,* p. 601.) The reason for this he states in his explanation of the First Commandment, where he says: "If any one had toothache, he fasted and honored St. Apollonia; if he was afraid of fire, he chose St. Lawrence as his helper in need; if he dreaded pestilence, he made a vow to St. Sebastian or Rochio, and a countless number of such abominations, where every one selected his own saint, worshiped him, and called for help to him in distress. . . . All these place their heart and trust elsewhere than in the true God, look for nothing good to Him nor seek it from Him." (*Ibid.,* p. 583.) Idolatry, no less than rank atheism, dishonors and supplants God. MUELLER.

A Tongue of Gold. — Dr. M. G. Kyle writes in the *Sunday-school Times* an enlightening editorial on an important find made in Palestine some years ago and now preserved at Constantinople. He says: "'A wedge of gold' and 'a goodly Babylonish garment' brought about the downfall of Achan at Jericho. God gave the Israelites the land, but forbade them to enrich themselves individually by plunder. The old spirit, however, was strong in this soldier Achan; temptation came, and he fell.

"But what was a 'wedge of gold'? It is probably useless to ask particularly about the 'goodly Babylonish garment,' for all textile fabrics have perished in the dampness of the climate of Palestine.

'A wedge of gold' is not so perishable. In the excavations at Gezer, MacAlister found one of these ingots used in early times in lieu of what is now more definitely coinage. The Hebrew in the account in Joshua says that Achan stole 'a tongue of gold.' The rule of safety is, 'In case of doubt take the safe course.' The English translators, both those of King James and of the company of revisers, did not do this. They did not know what 'a tongue of gold' might be, but they thought that at least it would be wedge-shaped. So they translated the expression, 'a wedge of gold.' When MacAlister found a specimen of it at Gezer, it was seen to be made in exact imitation of a sheep's tongue, and was literally 'a tongue of gold.' At that time Palestine was under the Turks. Hamdy Bey, at the head of the Museum of Constantinople, was a scholarly and energetic collector, and so the 'tongue of gold' was brought here, where it still reposes in its plush case to tempt the eyes of the avaricious. This ingot of gold has its story to tell. It certifies the detailed accuracy of the account in Joshua as reflecting exactly the customs of the times and is another instance and evidence of the minute accuracy of Scripture. This lump of gold could not figure in small business. There must have been great financial transactions then as now. Whether this 'tongue of gold' tells of ordinary transactions or of the tribute of kings, we cannot as yet know. Probably such pieces were weighed out in all great transactions." MUELLER.

Anti-Bible Societies. — A St. Louis daily tells of the doings of the Anti-Bible Society which has got out a circular denouncing the Bible for its "cannibalism," "witches," the "confidence game" played by Moses, etc., and will seek to slip a copy of it into every one of the 875,000 Bibles placed by the Gideons in the hotels of the country. When, in 1884, certain professors of theology in the Baltic Provinces waged war against the Verbal Inspiration, a lady complained tearfully, "I can no longer read the Bible." It would seem that the writer of the *Church Forum* of the daily from which we have been quoting belongs to this same latter anti-Bible society; for the article concludes with the statement: "But the St. Louis Gideons will not let it pass; they are going to raise 'the sword of the Lord and of Gideon' about it next Sunday at a meeting, and it is likely that 'Midian' will get a hard chase, although, of course, the delicacy of modern times forbids that any Ze-eb should be slain at a wine-press, as once happened." E.

Growing Disregard of the Old Standards of Chastity. — Ever and anon the true cause of the present-day divorce evil and other evils is emphasized, though as a rule the reasons are sought where they do not lie. Some time ago, as reported by the Associated Press, Judge Charles W. Rutledge, of St. Louis, published a list of causes for divorce which he had compiled from his year's experience in court. In order he named the following: drinking, swearing, associating with other women, nagging, scolding, faultfinding, love for gay life, solemnity and moodiness, independence, egotism, indifference, selfishness, slovenliness, jealousy, and cigaret smoking by women.

"I have been amazed," said Judge Rutledge, "by the attitude many men and women who come to the divorce court take toward adultery. It is infrequently offered as the chief ground for divorce. Women have told me they would not mind their husbands' unfaithfulness if only the men didn't brag about it. Husbands have surprised me by their willingness, in some instances, to forgive acts of infidelity on the part of their wives. The tendency seems to be toward a *single standard of immorality.* [Italics our own.] It would seem that women, instead of holding themselves to the standard of the past, are approaching the promiscuity of men."

Judge Rutledge says he thinks the old-fashioned standards are the foundation of happy married life, but they have been disrupted by a changing era. He submits three developments which, in his opinion, have contributed to the new viewpoint of marriage, as follows: —

"Children of divorced parents, in increasing numbers, are coming into divorce courts on their own account. They demonstrate that the divorce of parents destroys in the children a regard for the sacredness of marriage vows. Women have gone into business and have developed independence and a consciousness of their full rights as well as their ability to support themselves. They will not stand indignities at the hands of men when they marry which were borne by their mothers because of economic dependence. The World War sent two million young Americans to Europe, where they came in contact with European ideals of morality. They formed habits of less restraint over there and returned to spread the new conception of sex morality among friends at home."

The chief sufferers of the present-day divorce evil, according to Judge Rutledge, are the children, of whom he says: "As to children by a former marriage, I find them often treated with brutality by the new father and in some cases by the new mother. The idea generally seems to be that when people remarry, the children of either by a former marriage must be got out of the home and supported elsewhere. From talks with litigants who quarreled because of children, I find that they had not sufficiently talked over the problem before marriage, or if they did, they had not kept the promises they made."

Periodical fulminations against the divorce evil, such as are heard from time to time in the press, will not help the matter. True, the Law will reveal also the hideousness of this pollution, but it is only through the Gospel that a cure can be effected. The true benefactors of our nation in this matter are the God-fearing pastors, teachers, and parents, who in their quiet and humble way persist in instructing, warning, and guiding those over whom they have charge. They are the solid rocks that hold the dam of public security and well-being against the swelling waters of immorality, which would gush over and destroy everything. MUELLER.

A Presbyterian on the Evils of the Lodge. — Every now and then a voice is heard in non-Lutheran circles condemning lodgery. The *Australian Lutheran* recently brought to the attention of its

readers a letter written by a Presbyterian layman and published in the official organ of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, Australia. We reprint it here as a testimony showing that Lutherans are not the only people who recognize the sinfulness of the lodge system: —

"Sir: — It is ten thousand pities that Freemasonry is creeping into the life of our Church, which can only result in one thing — disruption in every church in which it exists. There is no room in Christianity for another brotherhood of man. The brotherhood of Christianity covers every human being who believes in the Fatherhood of God; and the fact that Christ said, 'No man can come unto the Father but by Me,' and that makes every man our brother. Could any system, any social club, speak of brotherhood and still exclude a poor man, a man down and out, or a man over a certain age? Freemasonry claims to be a religion, claims to be a branch of Christianity; then let Freemasonry place Christ in the Godhead; then there would be no such thing as the Great Architect of the Universe as far as Masonry was concerned. Because it denied to Christ the glory of the Godhead, it denied to Him the glory of being the Savior of mankind; and it taught that Christianity, with Christ at the head, was merely a sect.

"Wise old Abbot Gilebert says: 'All doctrine and religious books, etc., are suspect with me, and surely despised, which introduce no mention of Christ, which neither renews me with His Sacraments nor inflames me with His promises.' No man with a spot on his character can become a Freemason; he would be blackballed. Yet Christ forgave the sins of the crucified thief hanging alongside of Him and restored him to paradise.

"As a social club we find no fault with Freemasonry, when they keep to their club-room and manage their own business in their own way; but as a Presbyterian who has filled pretty well every office in our Church that a layman can fill, I strongly resent our Church and pulpit being used as a field for propaganda work in connection with Freemasonry until the Presbyterian Church and its women can enter their field.

"My mention of disruption is not a theory, but a fact, as it has already commenced. Elders, members, and adherents have left their church solely on account of this foreign element creeping into their place of worship. Down at the Easter camp of our Bible Class Union a paper was discussed, the subject of which was, 'Is There Any Difference between the Church and the Lodge?' No occasion to pass any remarks, the subject tells its own tale. A far more fitting subject in these days would have been, 'Can a Secret Society Justify Its Existence?' or 'Is Freemasonry Antichristian?'

"Only last year a Freemason said to a minister I know, 'Why don't you join up with us; it would help you in your church-work.' The minister replied, 'If my heavenly Father cannot help me sufficiently to carry on His work without the help of Freemasonry or any other society, I will throw it up and never open a Bible again.'"

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

The well-known theologian and pastor, Rev. William Peter Angerstein, of Lodz, Poland, has departed this life. He reached the age of eighty. It will be remembered that he was a friend of the Missouri Synod and sought contact with us.

The Lutheran Free Church (Norwegian), at its recent convention, rejected the plan favored by some of its members to merge with the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America.

The American Lutheran Survey has become defunct; the June issue of this year was the last one. The able editor, who wrote many good conservative articles for his magazine, Dr. W. H. Greever, will give all his time to the Lutheran Theological Seminary in South Carolina.

"After ten years of discussion and four years of actual planning the New York Synod, the Synod of New York and New England, and the New York Ministerium have each taken final action looking toward an early merger of the three into a new United Lutheran Synod of New York." (*N. L. C. B.*) We are sorry to see the old landmark of Lutheranism, the New York Ministerium, which, on the whole, stood for a conservative attitude, give up its identity. But, of course, after the merger of the larger bodies to which the synods mentioned belonged, they were all dwelling in the same house. It was simply a question whether they should occupy rooms on the same floor or continue to live one above the other.

Speaking of the loose talk one hears nowadays about the dead weight of doctrines and emphasis theron, hindering the progress of the Church, the *Presbyterian* appropriately quotes the preface to *Roberts' Rules of Order*, which contains this statement: "Where there is no law, but every man does what is right in his own eyes, there is the least of real liberty." The *Presbyterian* says in the course of its discussion: "Great corporations unite; but they unite around something more than mere spirit of good will. They unite under a pledge to observe great business principles, methods, doctrines, and rules." Well said! Let us not be ashamed of being called a doctrinal Church.

The second revision of the *Book of Common Prayer* having also been rejected by the English Parliament, some Britishers are becoming desperate. The Archbishop of Canterbury has lost heart and has resigned. Of course, he is eighty years old, and hence probably no longer equal to the strain of the controversy that has set in. The rejection of the new revision, it must be remembered, was even more decisive than that of the first one, the number of votes cast against acceptance being larger. The vote was 266 nays and 220 ayes. Some observers now predict disestablishment of the Church of England, that is, the separation of Church and State. That Parliament, having among its members many people who do not belong to the Church of England, has to pass on the form and contents of the Prayer-book of the Anglican Church is certainly an anomaly.

The large newspapers, as the *Lutherische Herold* points out, are always anxious to give much space to religious writers who attack their own church-bodies, and in their editorials they defend the malcontents and creed fighters. But when they themselves are attacked by one of their employees, they aver that the laws of tact and common sense have been violated, and the miscreant is dismissed. Such was the fate of Heywood Broun of the *New York World*, who had dared in an article appearing in the *Nation* to criticise his masters. What is flouted in the one case is practised in the other. What fairness!

We are informed that William Jewell College has retired from its faculty three professors because their religious beliefs are out of harmony with those commonly held by Baptists. (*Watchman-Examiner.*) This is certainly in keeping with the admonition of the New Testament to beware of false prophets.

The pitiful spectacle exhibited by ministers who meddle in politics is noticed not only by Lutherans. A quiet little woman is quoted by the *Presbyterian* as saying, "that her minister was at the head of everything excepting the directing of traffic at the most congested corners and that he was even suspected of wire-pulling for that job." The paper mentioned complains about the pastors who are "too busy to care for their lowly sick and poor, but always ready to act on a committee newly formed to renovate the world."

The American Bible Society has been granted permission to donate translations of the Bible in various languages to the student library of the theological department of the Mohammedan University of Constantinople. This theological department is the only higher educational institution in Turkey that teaches religion. (*N. L. C. B.*)

BOOK REVIEW.

German Gospel Sermons with English Outlines. By *Adam Fahling.* 428 pages, 6¼×9¼. Price, $3.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Some preachers believe that preaching in our day must be made attractive and, therefore, must be different from the preaching which has always been heard in our churches. For the preparation of their sermons such preachers do not draw mainly upon the immense wealth of the sound Biblical literature which our Lutheran Church has, but they read the sermonic and homiletical literature of modern and modernistic preachers, ape their ways, and unconsciously even copy some of their wrong thoughts; they fill their sermons with all manner of stories, whether they be pertinent or not; they fail to expound the text, not developing its thoughts in a logical and profitable manner; they use high-sounding words, and, to add a little spice, throw in some slang phrases; they speak in the abstract rather than in the concrete: in short, they aim to be "original," "up to date," "modern." The intention of these preachers is good, but their judgment is bad. Trying to avoid dull uniformity, they aim at variety, but get actual divergence. Instead of filling their garden with many beautiful flowers of all colors and shades and scents, they fill it with ugly, obnoxious, and even poisonous weeds. Such preachers are to be pitied; even more so the congregations which must hear them.

Not so the preacher whose new volume of sermons we are pleased to present to our readers. This preacher expounds the text. He does it on the basis of a good outline (introduction, theme, parts, conclusion); he announces his theme and parts, so that the hearer can better remember what he has gotten; he often quotes the words of the text; he uses plain, simple words and speaks the language of the Church as found in its Bible, its Catechism, and its hymnal; he speaks *ad hominem*. But, notwithstanding, the sermons of this preacher are different. Sometimes the introduction is long, sometimes short; the transition to theme and parts is not always couched in the same words; the language is chaste and dignified, but nevertheless homely; the subject-matter is presented in a conversational way, the sermons having been prepared for the pulpit and not for the press: the sermons of this preacher are not stereotyped. By drawing still more

heavily upon illustrations taken from the Bible, especially also the Old Testament, from history (both ecclesiastical and secular), and from everyday life, still greater variety can be gotten into one's sermons, and as a result they can, in the good sense of the word, be made more attractive and also more interesting and more profitable.

One thing, however, above all else must be stressed: the sermon, no matter what its own peculiarities of make-up may be, must preach the Gospel, pointing the way to Christ and, through faith in Christ, to everlasting life. The Christian sermon is a Gospel sermon.

A special feature of Pastor Fahling's volume of sermons is that to the *German* sermons he has added the *English* outline.

A preface to this volume of sermons has been written by Professor Martin S. Sommer, who says that the book, if purchased, is "a valuable addition to the preacher's homiletical library." FRITZ.

The Church at Corinth. By *Prof. John Th. Mueller, Ph. D.* 139 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, $1.25. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Because conditions are *essentially* the same in our Christian congregations as in those of the early Christian Church, therefore such letters as Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians are still of utmost interest and importance. Dr. Mueller shows "that the church at Corinth is a picture of the true church of to-day, 1. in preaching the message of Christ Crucified, and 2. in applying that message to the various problems confronting the present-day church." Such topics as the following are discussed: Church Factions, Church Discipline, Litigation, Abuse of the Body, Marriage, Christian Liberty, Disorders Arising from Disregarding Woman's Place, Spiritual Gifts. By giving a popular exposition of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, Dr. Mueller has done a real service to the laity of our churches, into whose hands, we trust, it may find its way. In these days of apostacy thorough indoctrination is the need of the hour. It is only in this way that, by the grace of God, our Lutheran Church can be kept from going the way which other church denominations have gone: the way of indifferentism and — unbelief. FRITZ.

Christian Day-Schools in Our Congregations. By the *Rev. E. J. Rudnick.* 51 pages, 6×9. 35 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This print of a synodical essay opens with the following words: "The most vital problem confronting our Church at the present time is the problem of Christian education. The problem with us is not, Which is the best means of giving our children a thorough Christian education? This has never been a problem in our Synod. From the beginning of its history to this day the Missouri Synod has held and contended that the only satisfactory solution of the educational problem is the Christian day-school. Nor is this a merely theoretical solution. It has been tested out by experience in hundreds of congregations. We have in our Synod a splendid system of Christian day-schools." The essayist answers two questions: "Why is it that in spite of the practically unanimous conviction in our midst that the Christian day-school is the best means of giving our children a thorough Christian education so many of our Missouri Synod congregations have no Christian day-school?" "What can and should be done in

order to arouse, maintain, and increase in the hearts of our people a deep and active interest in the Christian day-school, so that schools may be established in congregations without schools and that existing schools be brought to the highest standard of efficiency?"

The lack of indoctrination, even such as the Reformed churches could have given, has no doubt helped to pave the way for Modernism in those churches and for much of the ungodliness found in our country to-day. Not a few of the Reformed churches have in recent years deplored their shortsightedness and folly in respect to the Christian training of the young and have been making some provisions — rather late, of course, — to change the situation. Shall we, who for many years have enjoyed the blessings of a Christian training of the young by means of the Christian day-school, now grow cold and indifferent toward it? God forbid! Let us moreover learn not only the lesson of our own blessed experience, but also that which is taught us by the sad experience of others; let us rather increase our efforts in establishing many more Christian day-schools than we now have. Especially should we be mindful of the fact that the Christian training of children has by God Himself been made the duty of parents. And we ask, what better means could parents use than is offered them by the Christian day-school, which is established and maintained by the Christian congregation? Pastors — both such as have and such as have not a Christian day-school — should not fail to send for Pastor Rudnick's tract and discuss it with their congregation. FRITZ.

Statistical Year-Book. 1927. 211 pages. $1.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

How many pastors and how many congregations has the Missouri Synod? How large is each one of the twenty-nine synodical Districts? Who are the officers of the Synod and of its Districts? How many voting members and communicant members has the congregation at Oxford in the Southern Nebraska District? What is the value of its church property, and how much has that congregation contributed for outside purposes during the past year? How many English and how many German services are held in that congregation? How many pastors, congregations, preaching-places, baptized members, and communicant members has the Missouri Synod in each State of our country? What has been the gain or loss in membership in the various Districts during the past year? How many congregations in our Synod have over 3,000, over 2,500, over 1,000, or over 500 members? What is the percentage of English and German used in our Synod? What missions has our Synod? How many educational institutions, and where are they? How many students attend our educational institutions, and from which states do they come? How many parochial schools have we? What new books, tracts, and pamphlets were published by our Concordia Publishing House during the last year? Where are the charitable institutions of our Synod? How many members has the Walther League, the American Luther League, etc.? How many new churches and schools were dedicated during the last year? What about Synod's finances? What is the budget for the current year? Which pastors and teachers died during 1927? What synods constitute the Synodical Conference, and how large is each? What is the church-membership of the various denomina-

tions in the United States? How many members have the chief Christian religious bodies throughout the world? — Can you answer these and other questions? If not, buy a copy of Synod's *Statistical Year-Book*. Every pastor, teacher, and intelligent layman ought to have one on his desk for ready reference. Synod's statistician, the Rev. E. Eckhardt, compiled the book, and he has given much time and attention to important details. The price of one dollar does not pay for the printing of the book; it is published at a loss. FRITZ.

Something Better than Advice — Power! By *Martin S. Sommer*. Tract 108. 12 pages. Price, 5 cts.; doz., 36 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

"The world is full of good advice," says the author of this little tract. "We have, however, a very excellent reason for telling men something entirely different. There is a truth which does not contain a command or an advice, but actually contains the living power which will transform men, change their nature, take from them their wickedness and corruption, and give them in its stead the willingness and the power to do better. There is a preaching which, without irritating men by merely telling them to do what they cannot do, gives them power and willingness to do what they ought to do and to be what they ought to be." At a time when many churches of our country are giving much "advice," but are little, or not at all, preaching the everlasting Gospel, which alone is the power of God unto salvation, this is most assuredly a timely tract. A few hundreds or thousands distributed in a community will not fail to bring good results. And this is also a legitimate and good way of advertising our Church and its doctrine. FRITZ.

Happy School-Days. By *Margaret E. Sangster*. 271 pages, 5×7¼. $1.25. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This is a book for girls. In thirty-eight brief chapters such topics as the following are treated: Pluck, Perseverance and Punctuality; Perplexing Studies; Mathematics; Examination; The Unpopular Teacher; Getting Started in the Morning; Home Duties; The Art of Cooking; Music; False Values; Boy Friends; Health; The Care of the Eyes; Dress; Magnifying Troubles. Says the author: "School life has its shadow as well as its sunshine. But, girls, there is so much more sunshine than shadow that school life should be very satisfying to you." *Happy School-Days* is written in a pleasing style and is filled with many good suggestions. Every school girl will be the happier for reading it. Remember the book at Christmas time and let it be given to the girls for a Christmas present. FRITZ.

The Concordia Organist. *A Volume of Hymn Preludes.* Compiled by *J. H. F. Hoelter*. 74 pages, 9¼×12¼. $2.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This book of one hundred hymn preludes contains compositions by Kaeppel, Haase, Schumacher, Wismar, and Hoelter, well-known organists in our circles, and some selections from Faerber's collection of organ music. The preludes are of moderate difficulty, of good musical quality, and quite pleasing. A congregation which purchases this volume for its organist will be doing itself a favor. FRITZ.

Reminiscent Reflections of a Youthful Octogenarian. By *Dr. George Henry Gerberding.* 1928. 294 pages, 5½×7¾. $1.50. (Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis.)

The author of this autobiography departed this life soon after the book was written. Professor Gerberding tells the eventful story of his life from his childhood years on a hard-scrabble farm near Pittsburgh. "I truly did come up from the dung-hill." Then his early years at college, when there was "no more running out barefoot over the hoarfrost to chase up the cows in the pasture and to jump up and down in the place where they had lain to warm my red, cold feet." The teachers at college and seminary are etched with a fine tool upon the reader's memory, as are also the many characters, clerical and lay, whom the author describes in the chapters dealing with his life as missionary and professor. Professor Gerberding was a busy man all his life, yet he says: "I thought I was busy. But, oh, the time I wasted, sadly wasted, sinfully wasted! What countless, precious hours I dawdled and droned away over papers and periodicals! Most of it waste of time. The daily ought to be skimmed. The head-lines are generally enough. . . . I had been stupid enough to imagine that I needed to read my papers practically through. The sinful waste of time! And to think of ministers of the Gospel, undershepherds, fishers of men, watchers for souls, idling away precious hours every day!" (p. 236.) There are many trenchant observations on synodical history, but, strangely enough, not a word about the merger of the General Council with the General Synod. The few references to Missouri, such as they are, did not contribute to the pleasure of reading Professor Gerberding's volume. But he did his duty as a missionary and professor as he saw it and spared not himself. G.

Preaching Values in New Translations of the New Testament. By *Halford E. Luccock.* 312 pages; cloth; $2.00. (The Abingdon Press.)

In this volume the author endeavors to utilize the new translations of James Moffatt, R. F. Weymouth, and E. J. Goodspeed for the pulpit. The new versions in racy, up-to-date language suggest new thoughts to be applied in the sermon. Choosing a text, the author gathers around it some basic ideas given by certain words and enlarges upon them. Thus Mark 15, 37: "Jesus uttered *a loud cry* and yielded up His spirit" (translation by Weymouth), suggests the topic "Died of Heart-break"; Luke 11, 7: "Do not *pester me*" (Weymouth), the subject "Don't Pester Me"; 1 Cor. 3, 9: "You are God's farm" (Goodspeed), the subject "God's Farm"; 2 Cor. 10, 2: "My mind is made up to *tackle* certain people" (Moffatt), the subject "The Art of Tackling." The very mentioning of these subjects is sufficient to show that *Preaching Values* is not a book which we can recommend to our pastors. In many cases the new translations are decidedly inadequate, and even where they suggest the thought of the Greek in plainer words, they never approach the dignity and fulness of the Authorized Version. So much for the form. The *method* of evaluating the Scripture-texts, which the author proposes, is altogether reprehensible. Christian pastors are to *expound* the Scriptures, not to take certain words

of the text as a pretext to say something which is utterly foreign to it. The reviewer wishes to warn his brethren against the use of such books as *Preaching Values*. Preaching by such methods ultimately becomes a farce. MUELLER.

Simple Talks on the Holy Spirit. By *Rev. D. H. Dolman, M. A.* With an introduction by *James M. Gray, D. D.*, president of the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago. 169 pages. 50 cts. (Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.)

Pastor Dolman is a minister of the Church of England, who years ago was sent by his Church as a missionary to the Jews in Germany. His book does not claim scholarship; it is not a learned treatise on the Holy Ghost and His work, but rather a series of pleas to accept the ministrations of the Holy Ghost and to let Him accomplish His beneficent purposes of regeneration and sanctification. The *Simple Talks* are brief, pithy, touching appeals based on Scripture-passages, such as John 14, 16: "Another Comforter"; John 3, 3: "The Holy Spirit, the Giver of Life"; 1 Cor. 3, 16: "The Holy Spirit Dwells in You"; Eph. 4, 3: "Grieve Not the Holy Spirit"; Acts 7, 51: "Resist Not the Holy Spirit"; etc. In their presentation, application, and appeal they reflect the moderate Reformed theology of the Anglican Church, especially the evangelical type. The chapters are full of illustrations and stories, some of which, however, are misleading. Occasionally the sentences have an Arminianistic ring, though in other places the author is emphatic in teaching that salvation is the gift of God (cp. pp. 112 and 21). The book is full of exaggerations and inconsistencies, as well as of religious enthusiasm and error, and the lack of logical sequence is at times quite disturbing. Yet it belongs to the better books on religion written in recent years by sectarian writers. The author evidently is a sincere believer in Christ, and his appeals flow from a heart which is eager to win souls and foster the Christian life. There is so much in the book that is good that it may be used with profit by our pastors, provided they study it critically. Those wishing to preach on the Holy Ghost and His blessed work — and there ought to be much more of such preaching — will find in *Simple Talks* many fruitful suggestions. J. T. M.

Fast Hold on Faith, *and Other Sermons.* By the *Rev. Henry Howard,* Pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City. 275 pages, 5×7⅝. $2.00. (George H. Doran Company, New York.)

This book of sermons is characterized by the following quotation from a sermon on "Essential Sin" (John 16, 8. 9): "It wonderfully lightens the problem of the heathen world to remember that over all its cruelty and chaos there broods the tender Spirit of God. Wherever in pagan lands there is a desire in any human heart to get square with its record, however mistaken the methods employed, the will to be righteous is accepted, and to such is granted the freedom of the kingdom of God. The everywhere-present Spirit is in ministering attendance, to cherish every noble impulse, to stimulate every high resolve, and to assist the ascent of the soul from

moral darkness and death into the light and life of God. The heathen without exception have the consciousness of something better ever beckoning them on and up, and their sin, like ours, consists in not doing and becoming the best they know. 'But,' it may be asked, 'if the heathen may thus, by loyalty to the light they have, attain to the citizenship of the kingdom of God, why trouble to send them the Gospel at all?' The reply is twofold. First, because we are under orders. 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature,' is the command of the risen Christ to His Church, and the Church that fails to be aggressive weaves its own winding-sheet. In the interests of its own life, to say nothing of the lives of others, it must pass on the torch. To it has been committed the task of preparing the way of the Lord to the universal heart of man. But, secondly, it is no reason for withholding the sun of revelation because, forsooth, these nations are groping in the dim light of the stars. Those who move about in the moral twilight of truth surely have claims on us who enjoy its bright and broadening day. . . . So, while men may be able to find their way to the Celestial City along the dark track of heathen rites and ceremonies, with all their cruel superstitions, surely we, who know the highways to the City of God, are under obligation to make them known."

Does this call for any comment? We think not; for we know that our readers will readily recognize that what is offered is not the Gospel of Jesus Christ. FRITZ.

Man, God, and Immortality. Thoughts on Human Progress. Passages chosen from the writings of *Sir James George Frazer.* 437 pages, including index. $3.00. (The Macmillan Company, New York.)

The subtitle of this book, "Thoughts on Human Progress," indicates the scope and purpose of this book, which may briefly be described as an attempt to solve the problem how man, a creature of evolution, in the course of the ages acquired the concepts of a higher civilization, of God, and of immortality. Sir J. G. Frazer is a scholar of note, and he fully exhausts the rich material which has been accumulated by modern research in anthropology. His book contains also all the faults of works written by evolutionistic anthropologists — unwarranted conclusions, snap judgments, false syllogisms, inferences based on too meager information, blasphemies, etc. He himself is an agnostic atheist, who, in the last chapter of the book, "The Unending Search," closes his investigations with the sad confession: "For the thinker there is no permanent place of rest. He must move forever forward, a pilgrim of the night eternally pressing towards the faint and glimmering illumination that eternally retreats before him." p. 421. Certainly, to one like Sir James Frazer, who sees in the sublime mystery of the Lord's Supper only a further development of the savage custom of "eating his god," p. 404 f., and who traces the vicarious atonement of Christ to the ancient myths of Babylonia and India, p. 407 f., the truth must forever remain unknown and unknowable. To students of the theory of evolution this volume is of interest in that it shows them the vagaries and idiocies of the men who apply this theory to the practical phases of life. J. T. M.